

consumer the choice of determining which service provider can place service and equipment on their lines! This is NOT a Telecom Act of 96 decision point to be determined by the FCC. Unless you are proposing changing Congress's 1968 CarterPhone Decision and 1984 Modified Final Judgment as well as the ongoing telecom development practice covered by the Land Development Act.

While I agree with your position limiting the ILEC's liability to unbundle their electronics and their having to wholesale their systems at below "un-documented" cost of delivery I cannot agree with your a general opinion on not supporting the 96 Telecom Act's position on line sharing. Let's set the demand where competitive facilities based carriers can enter the market and provide the consumer with truly competitive and future proof services that do not further place the public telecommunications system into debit. The commission needs to seriously consider Structurally Separating the customer's service wire from the ILEC.

I would be very happy to discuss with you my position on this matter and share more details of our company's service deployment. I am addressing you as a concerned citizen, a voter, phone bill payer and small business owner wanting to make sure that the competitive telecom choices given to the consumer by our forefathers are not inadvertently taken away.

Respectfully,
Angus O Dougherty
President/CEO
AirCover Network Solutions, Inc

cc Greg Sopkin
Chairman
Colorado Public Utility Commission

CC: governorowens@state.co.us, Michael Copps, Commissioner Adelstein, Kathleen Abernathy, slevine@americasnetwork.com



Angus O Dougherty
PresidentKO-Founder
AirCover Network Solutions Inc.

1700 W 100th
Suite 104
Thornton, CO. 80260-8004
United States of America

(303) 439-9535 (Work Voice)
(303) 404-0050 (Home Voice)
(303) 591-8074 (Voice Cell)
(303) 404-0049 (Work Fax)

angus@aircovr.com (Preferred Internet)

<http://www.aircovr.com>

Version

2.1

Name

Family. Dougherty
First Angus
Middle O
Prefix
Suffix

Formatted Name

Angus O Dougherty

Oraanization

AirCover Network Solutions Inc

Title

PresidenVCo-Founder

Telephone Number (Work Voice)
(303) 439-9535

Telephone Number (Home Voice)
(303) 404-0050

Telephone Number (Voice Cell)
(303) 591-8074

Telephone Number (Work Fax)
(303) 404-0049

Angus O Dougherty
President/Co-Founder
AirCover Network Solutions Inc.

1700 W 100th
Suite 104
Thornton, CO. 80260-8004
United States of America

(303) 439-9535 (Work Voice)
(303) 404-0050 (Home Voice)
(303) 591-8074 (Voice Cell)
(303) 404-0049 (Work Fax)

angus@aircovr.com (Preferred Internet)

<http://www.aircovr.com>

Version

2 1

Name

Family Dougherty
First Angus
Middle O
Prefix
suffix

Formatted Name

Angus O Dougherty

Organization

AirCover Network Solutions Inc

Title

President/Co-Founder

Telephone Number (Work Voice)
(303) 439-9535

Telephone Number (Home Voice)
(303) 404-0050

Telephone Number (Voice Cell)
(303) 591-8074

Telephone Number (Work Fax)
(303) 404-0049

Address (Work)*P.O.* Address:

Extended Address:

Street 1700 W 100th
Suite 104*Locality* Thornton

Region CO

Postal Code 80260-8004

Country United States of America

Deliver+Label (Work)

1700 W 100th

Suite 104

Thornton CO 80260-8004

United States of America

Uniform Resource Locator<http://www.aircovr.com>**Electronic Mail Address** (Preferred Internet)angus@aircovr.com**Last Revision**

20021209T202838Z

Angus O Dougherty
PresidentKO-Founder
AirCover Network Solutions Inc.

1700 W 100th
Suite 104
Thornton, CO. 80260-8004
United States of America

(303) 439-9535 (Work Voice)
(303) 404-0050 (Home Voice)
(303) 591-8074 (Voice Cell)
(303) 404-0049 (Work Fax)

angus@aircovr.com (Preferred Internet)

<http://www.aircovr.com>

Version

2.1

Name

Family Dougherty
First Angus
Middle O
Prefix:
suffix:

Formatted Name

Angus O Dougherty

Organization

AirCover Network Solutions Inc

Title

President/Co-Founder

Telephone Number (Work Voice)
(303) 439-9535

Telephone Number (Home Voice)
(303) 404-0050

Telephone Number Voice Cell)
(303) 591-8074

Telephone Number Work Fax)
(303) 404-0049

Address (Work)
P O Address
ExtendedAddress
Street 1700 W 100th
Suite 104
Locality Thornton
Region CO
Postal Code 80260-8004
country United States of America

Delivery Label (Work)
1700 W 100th
Suite 104
Thornton, CO. 80260-8004
United States of America

Uniform Resource Locator
<http://lw.aircovr.com>

Electronic Mail Address (Preferred Internet)
angus@aircovr.com

Last Revision
20021209T202838Z

From: Aspazomaii@aol.com
To: Michael Copps
Date: Mon, Feb 17, 2003 8:59 AM
Subject: rules change

Please consider how much money the Bells have invested in everything other than what they are supposed to have invested and/or are trying to invest in. Many smaller companies which have made the investments will be driven out of business and then swallowed **by** the **bells** for nothing. Will this be the solution for competition?

Thank You,

J. Szeneri

From: Bob
To: Kathleen Abernathy. Mike Powell, Commissioner Adelstein. Michael Copps, KM
KJMWEB
Date: Wed, Feb 19.2003 7:10 PM
Subject: UNE-P deregulation

Deregulation has NEVER worked, not once. We here in CA know more about deregulation than most; monopolies result, every time. Cut the Baby Bells loose and we WILL all pay more. Give it up on UNE-P deregulation...

thanks for your concern,
Bob McCombs

From: Bob
To: Kathleen Abernathy, Mike Powell, Commissioner Adelstein. Michael **Copps**. KM
KJMWEB
Date: Wed, Feb 19.2003 7:10 PM
Subject: UNE-P deregulation

Deregulation has NEVER worked, not once. We here in CA know more about deregulation than most; monopolies result, every time. Cut the Baby Bells loose and we WILL all pay more. Give it **up** on UNE-P deregulation...

thanks for your concern,
Bob McCornbs

From: Carmen/Gene Ramos
To: Carmen/Gene Ramos
Date: Wed, Feb 19, 2003 10:26 PM
Subject: Proposed FCC Changes Cost Consumers

Message sent to the following recipients:

Senator Schumer

Senator Clinton

Representative Meeks

Message text follows:

Carmen/Gene Ramos
145-27 167 street
JAMAICA, NY 11434

February 19, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

[recipient name was inserted here],

The Federal Communications Commission is considering taking actions that will restrict consumer choice by deregulating local phone service.

Millions of Americans like me could have their phone service threatened if the local phone companies aren't required to allow competitors access to the market. I'm also concerned about the Commission's move to relieve all broadband Internet access facilities of open access obligations.

Both of these key decisions will limit my choices as a consumer by lessening competition, diminishing cost savings and threatening consumer protections. As a constituent, I urge you to support competition and open access for local phone service.

Sincerely,

Gene /Carmen Ramos

From: Charles Wykoff
To: Charles Wykoff
Date: Wed, Feb 19, 2003 7:30 PM
Subject: Proposed FCC Changes Cost Consumers

Message sent to the following recipients:

Senator Campbell

Senator Allard

Representative Tancredo

Message text follows:

Charles Wykoff
3076 S Idalia St
Aurora, CO 80013-1660

February 19, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

[recipient name was inserted here]

The Federal Communications Commission is considering taking actions that will restrict consumer choice by deregulating local phone service.

Millions of Americans like me could have their phone service threatened if the local phone companies aren't required to allow competitors access to the market. I'm also concerned about the Commission's move to relieve all broadband Internet access facilities of open access obligations.

Both of these key decisions will limit my choices as a consumer by lessening competition, diminishing cost savings and threatening consumer protections. As a constituent, I urge you to support competition and open access for local phone service.

Sincerely,

Charles Wykoff

From: DARRELL SMITH
To: Mike Powell
Date: Thu. Feb 20, 2003 2:10 **AM**
Subject: triennial review

Honorable Mr. Powell,

Thanks for the remarkable race you have ran trying to pull regulations into perspective line with the current industry course. I proudly say i known that we haven't heard the last of your great ideas **yet. By** the way, I hope that your bad back is doing ok these days. I know that the days can be painfully long sometimes.
Your friend,

Lyn smith

From: Diana L. Mondini
To: Diana L. Mondini
Date: Thu, Feb20.2003 2:10 AM
Subject: Proposed FCC Changes Cost Consumers

Message sent to the following recipients:

Senator Hutchison

Senator Cornyn

Representative Barton

Message text follows:

Diana L. Mondini
5501 Summit Ridge Trail
Arlington, TX 76017

February 20, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

[recipient name was inserted here],

The Federal Communications Commission is considering taking actions that will restrict consumer choice by deregulating local phone service.

Millions of Americans like me could have their phone service threatened if the local phone companies aren't required to allow competitors access to the market. I'm also concerned about the Commission's move to relieve all broadband Internet access facilities of open access obligations.

Both of these key decisions will limit my choices as a consumer by lessening competition, diminishing cost savings and threatening consumer protections. As a constituent, I urge you to support competition and open access for local phone service

Sincerely,

Diana L. Mondini

From: Eric S. Johansson
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB. Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Wed, Feb 19, 2003 9:15 AM
Subject: comments on UNE

I know you're in the process of discussing whether or not to release ILECS from their UNE obligations. I believe the FCC should not reclassify ILECs as nondominant and exempt them from renting out UNEs. I get my DSL from a CLEC. Without the ability to rent copper and space for a DSLAM I would be stuck with a single supplier for bandwidth and I would not be able to find competition for local phone service. Unlike the service I have now, I would not be able to run my own servers, I would be stuck with consume only capabilities, I would have extremely limited upload speeds, and subject to an unacceptable appropriate use policy.

Verizon has always delivered a crippled DSL service in order to protect its T1 market and the other ILECS are no different. It is only competitors using UNE that make it possible to get a good quality DSL service at a reasonable price with reasonable use policies

It is extremely unlikely that competitors will ever build their own facilities outside of CO cage contents. The reason is simple economics. last mile is a natural monopoly and no amount of ideology will change that fact. The only solution at last mile is some form of UNE wholesale access. if the ILECs do not wish to rent, let them implement structural separation and spinoff the infrastructure as a separate, regulated entity.

In summary, keep UNE because it's good for real competition.

---eric
Eric S. Johansson
90 Stoneybrook Road
Westford Massachusetts 01886
978-392-3650

From: George Issa
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, Feb 15, 2003 12:12 AM
Subject: Hello Kathleen - quick question

My name is George Issa and I am a 21 year-old college student in Boston, Ma.

Just wondering if the FCC is considering removing line sharing as an unbundled requirement

If they are and do, it will kill residential DSL choice & competition plain and simple; two principles that this country was built on.

Any further insight would be extremely beneficial.

Happy Valentines Day
George Issa
617.201.0207

From: George Quick
To: George Quick
Date: Wed, Feb 19.2003 6:05 PM
Subject: Proposed FCC Changes Cost Consumers

Message sent to the following recipients:

Senator Graham
Senator Nelson
Representative Feeney
Message text follows.

George Quick
5957 Broken Bow Lane
Port Orange, FL 32127-7582

February 19.2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

[recipient name was inserted here]

The Federal Communications Commission is considering taking actions that will restrict consumer choice by deregulating local phone service.

Millions of Americans like me could have their phone service threatened if the local phone companies aren't required to allow competitors access to the market. I'm also concerned about the Commission's move to relieve all broadband Internet access facilities of open access obligations.

Both of these key decisions will limit my choices as a consumer by lessening competition, diminishing cost savings and threatening consumer protections. As a constituent, I urge you to support competition and open access for local phone service.

Sincerely,

George R. Quick

From: Greg Prince
To: Greg Prince
Date: Wed, Feb 19, 2003 4:41 PM
Subject: Proposed FCC Changes Cost Consumers

Message sent to the following recipients:

Senator Brownback

Senator Roberts

Representative Tiahrt

Message text follows:

Greg Prince
PO Box 16783
Wichita, KS 67211

February 19, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

[recipient name was inserted here],

The Federal Communications Commission is considering taking actions that will restrict consumer choice by deregulating local phone service.

Millions of Americans like me could have their phone service threatened if the local phone companies aren't required to allow competitors access to the market. I'm also concerned about the Commission's move to relieve all broadband Internet access facilities of open access obligations.

Both of these key decisions will limit my choices as a consumer by lessening competition, diminishing cost savings and threatening consumer protections. As a constituent, I urge you to support competition and open access for local phone service.

Sincerely,

Greg Prince

From: Gwendolyn Salter
To: Gwendolyn Salter
Date: Wed, Feb 19.2003 9:15 PM
Subject: Proposed FCC Changes Cost Consumers

Message sent to the following recipients:

Representative Cox

Message text follows:

Gwendolyn Salter
3619 Surfview Lane
Corona del Mar, CA 92625

February 19,2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

[recipient name was inserted here],

Im concerned about the Commissions move to relieve all broadband Internet access facilities of open access obligations.

This will limit my choices as a consumer by lessening competition, diminishing cost savings and threatening consumer protections. **As** a constituent, I urge you to support competition and open access for local phone service.

Sincerely,

Gwendolyn Salter

From: Helen Harden
To: Helen Harden
Date: Wed, Feb 19, 2003 1:48 PM
Subject: Proposed FCC Changes Cost Consumers

Message sent to the following recipients:

Senator Hutchison

Senator Cornyn

Representative Johnson

Message text follows:

Helen Harden
1418 Rogers Avenue
Lancaster. TX 75134-3111

February 19, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

[recipient name was inserted here],

The Federal Communications Commission is considering taking actions that will restrict consumer choice by deregulating local phone service.

Millions of Americans like me could have their phone service threatened if the local phone companies aren't required to allow competitors access to the market. I'm also concerned about the Commission's move to relieve all broadband Internet access facilities of open access obligations

Both *of* these key decisions will limit my choices as a consumer by lessening competition, diminishing cost savings and threatening consumer protections. As a constituent, I urge you to support competition and open access for local phone service

Sincerely,

Helen R. Harden

From: Henry Broadbent
To: Henry Broadbent
Date: Wed, Feb 19, 2003 4:44 PM
Subject: Proposed FCC Changes Cost Consumers

Message sent to the following recipients:

Senator Feinstein

Senator Boxer

Representative Dreier

Message text follows:

Henry Broadbent
605 Windsor Rd. #7
Arcadia. CA 91007-2705

February 19, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

[recipient name was inserted here],

The Federal Communications Commission is considering taking actions that will restrict consumer choice **by** deregulating local phone service.

Millions of Americans like me could have their phone service threatened if the local phone companies aren't required to allow competitors access to the market. I'm also concerned about the Commission's move to relieve all broadband Internet access facilities of open access obligations.

Both of these key decisions will limit my choices as a consumer by lessening competition, diminishing cost savings and threatening consumer protections. As a constituent, I urge you to support competition and open access for local phone service.

Sincerely,

H Broadbent

From: Howard Lieberman
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sun, Feb 16, 2003 10:50 AM
Subject: Telecom Competition

Chariman Powell:

It appears obvious to me that this "competition" idea, in the telecommunications industry is not working at all. The net effect is to raise costs to the small consumer. The companies that are supposedly pursuing competition, do not play by the same rules as the local telephone company. They don't have to service EVERYONE that may want service. They "cherry pick" the best commercial accounts in the most dense and cost effective areas.. This practice takes the most profitable business away from the local companies, that helps subsidise more costly and less profitable areas that they MUST serve. When a "competitive" service shares the local phone company's equipment, that company must still maintain those lines. None can tell me that someone reselling someone elses services or products can be more cost efficient than direct sales. Everyone has to get a piece of the action.

The same effect has ocured with splitting long distance service. Large companies are seeing lower rates, but, the small consumer gets charged a fee to not have a long distance provider, or a minimum fee for long distance, even if the don't make any or many long distance calls. With taxes on both local and long distance services, the comsumer gets hit twice. To me this has been a disaster, cost wise. Again, the long distance income used to subsidise some of the less profitable accounts. Now, with the long distance split, the local companies who provide long distance services now see fit to charge a minimum monthly fee for long distance, when it used to be pay for what you use before the split.

Our founding forefathers were very wise. When the foresaw that a regulated monopoly is the best way to make sure that service is available to all that want it, at a reasonable price. This has gone to heck with the deregulation of the telecom industry, including cable services. Our cable TV rates are higher then ever, adjusted for inflation, and that competition has not appeared to bring prices down.

There are some instances where competition does NOT MAKE SENSE. If they have to provide their own lines, and play by the same rules, maybe. But it is NOT WORKING.

Howard Lieberman
MicroNet Associates, Inc.
620 Herndon Parkway, Suite 200
Herndon, Virginia 20170
703.620.2075
howard@micronetmail.net or
howard@mna-inc.com

From: Howard Lieberman
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sun, Feb 16, 2003 10:50 AM
Subject: Telecom Competition

Chariman Powell:

It appears obvious to me that this "competition" idea, in the telecommunications industry is not working at all. The net effect is to raise costs to the small consumer. The companies that are supposedly pursuing competition, do not play by the same rules as the local telephone company. They don't have to service EVERYONE that may want service. They "cherry pick" the best commercial accounts in the most dense and cost effective areas.. This practice takes the most profitable business away from the local companies. that helps subsidise more costly and less profitable areas that they MUST serve. When a "competitive" service shares the local phone company's equipment, that company must still maintain those lines. None can tell me that someone reselling someone else's services *or* products can be more cost efficient than direct sales. Everyone has to get a piece of the action.

The same effect has occurred with splitting long distance service. Large companies are seeing lower rates, but, the small consumer gets charged a fee to not have a long distance provider, or a minimum fee for long distance, even if they don't make any or many long distance calls. With taxes on both local and long distance services, the consumer gets hit twice. To me this has been a disaster, cost wise. Again, the long distance income used to subsidise some of the less profitable accounts. Now, with the long distance split, the local companies who provide long distance services now see fit to charge a minimum monthly fee for long distance, when it used to be pay for what you use before the split.

Our founding forefathers were very wise. When they foresaw that a regulated monopoly is the best way to make sure that service is available to all that want it, at a reasonable price. This has gone to heck with the deregulation of the telecom industry, including cable services. Our cable TV rates are higher than ever, adjusted for inflation, and that competition has not appeared to bring prices down.

There are some instances where competition does NOT MAKE SENSE. If they have to provide their own lines, and play by the same rules, maybe. But it is NOT WORKING.

Howard Lieberman
MicroNet Associates, Inc.
620 Herndon Parkway, Suite 200
Herndon, Virginia 20170
703.620.2075
howard@micronetmail.net or
howard@mna-inc.com

From: Irene K Rausen
To: akovacs@yesinvest.Com. kburns@yesinvest.com
Date: Fri, Feb 14, 2003 9:56 AM
Subject: Anna-Maria Kovacs' note on the rescheduled Triennial Review Meeting

Attached please find Anna-Maria Kovacs' note on the rescheduled Triennial Review Meeting

Anna-Maria Kovacs. Ph.D., CFA
Managing Director - Research
Commerce Capital Markets
124 Mount Auburn Street
Suite 200 North
Cambridge, MA 02138
(617) 576-5764 Phone
(617) 576-5701 Fax
akovacs@yesinvest.com



Anna-Maria Kovacs, Ph.D., CFA
Kristin Burns, Ph.D.
Gregory Vitale
517-575-5754
akovacs@commerccapitalmarkets.com

February 14.2003

The FCC has ~~issued~~ the agenda for its next meeting, which was postponed from February 13th to February 20th, with only ~~one~~ item—the Triennial review. While there is some chance of another postponement, we consider that to be quite unlikely, because ~~the~~ Commission will make every attempt to meet the D.C. Circuit's deadline. Having said that, the debate among the commissioners is still quite fluid, and no definitive agreements among the ~~commissioners~~ had been reached as of last night.

- ☒ For both existing customers and new prospects, we expect a pleasing and high-quality experience.
- ☒ We expect a pleasing and high-quality experience for both existing customers and new prospects.
- ☒ We expect a pleasing and high-quality experience for both existing customers and new prospects, and we expect a pleasing and high-quality experience for both existing customers and new prospects.

[illegible]

The following states have enacted legislation that would require the disclosure of information regarding the ownership and control of companies that are subject to the SEC's anti-corruption rules:

- Arizona
- California
- Colorado
- Connecticut
- Delaware
- District of Columbia
- Florida
- Hawaii
- Illinois
- Indiana
- Iowa
- Kansas
- Maine
- Maryland
- Massachusetts
- Michigan
- Minnesota
- Mississippi
- Montana
- Nebraska
- Nevada
- New Hampshire
- New Jersey
- New Mexico
- New York
- North Carolina
- North Dakota
- Oklahoma
- Rhode Island
- South Carolina
- South Dakota
- Tennessee
- Texas
- Vermont
- Virginia
- Washington
- West Virginia
- Wisconsin
- Wyoming

American states that have enacted or plan to enact legislation that would require the disclosure of information regarding the ownership and control of companies that are subject to the SEC's anti-corruption rules.

x Loop rates for 2022 are not available for the following states: Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

effect that oilnet prices will rise somewhat in the short run, but that the long-run impact on states is likely to be very small and may, in fact, be negative. The report also notes that an eventual backstop for cheap oil is not a foregone conclusion.

What this means to us is that

because of the secret marketing strategy and the fact that the product had already been patented and sold elsewhere. The company's sales were limited in its American market. The product was not sold in the United States, and it reached substantial penetration throughout and reached a large number of customers at a relatively low cost. The product was sold in the United States, and it reached substantial penetration throughout and reached a large number of customers at a relatively low cost.

IX. EXPORTING PROGRAMS SUBMITTING TO THE EXPORT CONTROL REGIME
already been attacked, and 2) declared that the program was not intended
to be much slower than the program used by the CIA.

Small LEDS are direct current devices and will be indirectly driven by the LED driver circuit. The LED driver circuit will be an inverting buck converter. The LED driver circuit will be implemented in a 4-layer PCB via settlement (as shown in the figure below).

END

[illegible]

© 2003 CoC Compiler

Strong Buy (83) **Block**. Inspected to cooperatively inspect airports and other facilities.

Mark: ~~See Part D~~
and/or its grounds

COMMERCE

* - By the 1880s, the railroad had become the dominant mode of long-distance travel in the United States.

Institutional Sales A fund's sales to institutional investors, such as pension funds, insurance companies, and other large financial institutions.

From: Jeff Bower
To: Commissioner Adelstein, KM KJMWEB, Michael Copps, Kathleen Abernathy, Mike Powell
Date: Wed, Feb 19.2003 10:13 AM
Subject: History to repeat itself!!!

HOW MANY TIMES DOES HISTORY HAVE TO REPEAT ITSELF. ONCE AGAIN THE COMMISSION IS ABOUT TO PUT FORTH ANOTHER REVIEW THAT WILL BE THROWN OUT IN COURT. ONCE AGAIN THE CHAIRMAN POWELL STANDS TO WRITE ANOTHER DISSENT THAT WILL SHOW WHY THE OTHER FCC COMMISSIONERS ARE INCOMPETENT IN CREATING A SOUND LEGAL STANCE TO PROMOTE TELECOMMUNICATIONS..... DO YOU UNDERSTAND WHY THESE GET THROWN OUT IN COURT. BECAUSE YOU CANNOT MAKE A LAW. ALL YOU DO IS INTERPRET THE LAW!!!!!!! THE SUPREME COURT DOESN'T TRADE UNE-P FOR STATES RIGHTS FOR LINESHARING. THAT IS NOT YOUR JOB. YOU CANNOT JUST TRADE CONCESSIONS. THAT IS NOT THE LAW!!!

DON'T WASTE A WHOLE YEARS WORTH OF WORK BY PUSHING FORTH A TRIENNIAL REVIEW PLAN THAT WILL BE THROWN OUT IN COURT. LISTEN TO MICHAEL POWELL. HE'S DISSENTED TWICE IN HISTORY ON THIS MATTER AND BOTH TIMES HE'S CORRECT IN HIS ANALYSIS. YOU MAY NOT LIKE THE GUY BUT AT LEAST HE KNOWS TO KEEP OWN PERSONAL AGENDAS OUT OF THE REVIEW PROCESS AND REVIEW BASED ON WHAT WILL STAND UP IN COURT. THAT'S WHY HE'S ALWAYS THE DISSENTER. BECAUSE HE'S NOT WILLING TO CIRCUMVENT THE LAW.

THIS IS SIMPLE. FOR EVERY STANCE, YOU SHOW IN THE TELECOM ACT OF 1996 YOU SUPPORTING EVIDENCE. IF IT'S NOT IN THERE, DON'T VOTE THAT WAY. IT'S BEEN DONE IN THE PAST AND EVERY SINGLE TIME IT HAS BEEN THROWN OUT IN COURT.

SOMETIMES I FEEL IT'S THE FCC MAIN OBJECTIVE TO CONTINUE TO THROW THINGS INTO THE COURT!!!!

LOOK AT UNE. ALL OF UNE WILL BE THROWN OUT IN 1 DAY BECAUSE THE PRIOR COMMISSION MADE A 1 ERROR, THAT'S WHAT THE COURTS DO. THEY FIND 1 ERROR OUT THE WINDOW YOUR REVIEW GOES. THEY ARE THROWING OUT ALL OF UNE.

WHAT A WASTE ! YOU'RE GOING TO PUT FORTH A PLAN THAT WILL FUND THE LAWYERS FOR THE NEXT 2 YEARS INSTEAD OF THE TELECOM INDUSTRY AND EMPLOYMENT IN TELECOM.

EXCELLENT JOB!

From: Jim Langstaff
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Tue, Feb 18.2003 1:38 AM
Subject: <no subject>

This letter relates to the FCC upcoming rule changes for broadband and telecom.

Forcing the "baby Bells" to lease their networks at rates that are below market rates has overtime led to "artificially" lower rates for consumers. Now that many telecom companies are full of debt and near bankrupt --would it not make much more sense to have everyone pay closer to market rates -- end the subsidy and forced discounts so that many great American Telecom companies can turn themselves around and avoid bankruptcy.

As an example, do consumers really need to pay only a few cents a minute for long distance -- if this artificial and false economy is leading to telecom bankruptcies.

Why not let the Baby Bells charge market rates for their networks and require competitors to overtime build their own networks. This would not only revive the Baby Bells but would probably revive the network manufactures such as the Lucent, and Nortel etc of the world.

Yours sincerely,

James H. Langstaff,
265 Empress Avenue
Toronto, Ontario. M2N 3V2
(416) 225-8086

From: John Erb
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Mon, Feb 17, 2003 4:51 PM
Subject: Save line sharing

Please preserve line-sharing. Let people have choice and competition for their DSL business.

John Erb

From: Karalyn Shima
To: Mike Powell
Date: Thu. Feb 13, 2003 9:43 AM
Subject: PLEASE SAVE THE UNE-PLATFORM

Good morning Chairman Powell,

Thank you for your time and consideration in reading the very important attached letter regarding **the** availability of the UNE-P.

Karalyn Shima
Marketing Representative
Access One. Inc.
P. 312 441 1000x936
F: 312441 1010
w.AccessOneInc.com



February 13th, 2003

Dear Chairman Michael Powell:

I ask your support for the continued availability of the UNE-Platform "

My company, Access One, offers local telephone service in the SBC territories. The company has achieved increasing success largely because it utilizes the combination of "unbundled network elements" -- the UNE-Platform -- to serve customers. It is absolutely critical that we have continued access to the UNE-Platform to remain competitive.

Unfortunately, the Regional Bell Operating Companies have launched a full-scale attack on the UNE-Platform, realizing it is a major threat to their continued market dominance. Their strategy is to impose certain restrictions on individual network elements that would destroy the competitive value of the UNE-Platform. If the RBOCs succeed, it will all but end any chance for consumers to enjoy the benefits of meaningful competition in local phone service.

Please oppose any effort at the Federal Communications Commission or at state agencies to limit the availability of the UNE-Platform. The UNE-Platform should be firmly and permanently established as a viable service option for competitive telecom carriers.

Thank you very much for your time and attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,

Karalyn Shima
Marketing Representative
Access One Incorporated

From: Lisa Geiszler
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Wed, Feb 19, 2003 7:28 PM
Subject: reject monopoly bid

Commissioner,

I urge you not to vote for the elimination of competitive access to wholesale phone network. This would kill local competition, increase phone rates and leave consumers with the worst of both worlds, an unregulated monopoly. Please reject the Bell's self-serving proposals to eliminate the UNE-Ps, which would pave the way for a bigger, meaner phone monopoly unrestrained by regulatory oversight. Most consumers are already unhappy with the phone service they receive, passing this would just increase this frustration and anger and would only benefit the corporation without helping the consumer at all.

Sincerely,

Lisa Geiszler

The new MSN 8: advanced junk mail protection and 2 months FREE*
<http://join.msn.com/?page=features/junkmail>

From: MAEdwards@EdwardsIndustries.net
To: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Mike Powell, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Wed, Feb 19.2003 5:47 PM
Subject: Keep UNE-P

Message from M.A. Edwards

Edwards Industries/ARC Systems division
2371 Canal Road
Sparks, Nevada 89434

Dear FCC Commissioners:

The Bells are simply attempting to rebuild the monopoly of old. That program didn't work then, and won't work now. The only fair way for competition to take hold and grow is to allow UNE-P to continue until Bell is required to separate the local loop. Once Bell has to live with the same rules imposed on the competition, and the regulatory agencies can determine a fair rate for the use of the loop, there will be no question of 'fairness'.

Threats of job loss and refusal to invest in plant should be rejected out of hand. If the Bells do not wish to invest in their plant, remove the certificate of public convenience and necessity and give it to a company that will honor that principle. Let the Bell then be a REAL competitor and see how they like it. The PSTN was built with funds guaranteed by the ratepayer; it doesn't belong to an RBOC. Somebody needs to remember that. There will always be a PSTN. nobody says it has to be run by an RBOC.

I encourage this Commission to look to the broader view, and what is good for the public and its convenience, not to the monopolistic desires of the few huge and uncontrollable telcos.

Sincerely

M.A. Edwards

Generated by :
EasyForm - Copyright 1999 by Thomas J. Delorme
<http://getperl.virtualave.net>

From: MAEdwards@EdwardsIndustries.net
To: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Mike Powell, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Wed, Feb 19.2003 5:47 PM
Subject: Keep UNE-P

Message from M.A. Edwards

Edwards Industries/ARC Systems division
2371 Canal Road
Sparks, Nevada 89434

Dear FCC Commissioners:

The Bells are simply attempting to rebuild the monopoly of old. That program didn't work then, and won't work now. The only fair way for competition to take hold and grow is to allow UNE-P to continue until Bell is required to separate the local loop. Once Bell has to live with the same rules imposed on the competition, and the regulatory agencies can determine a fair rate for the use of the loop, there will be no question of 'fairness'.

Threats of job loss and refusal to invest in plant should be rejected out of hand. If the Bells do not wish to invest in their plant, remove the certificate of public convenience and necessity and give it to a company that will honor that principle. Let the Bell then be a REAL competitor and see how they like it. The PSTN was built with funds guaranteed by the ratepayer; it doesn't belong to an RBOC. Somebody needs to remember that. There will always be a PSTN. nobody says it has to be run by an RBOC.

I encourage this Commission to look to the broader view, and what is good for the public and its convenience, not to the monopolistic desires of the few huge and uncontrollable telcos.

Sincerely,

M.A. Edwards

Generated by :
EasyForm - Copyright 1999 by Thomas J. Delorme
<http://getperl.virtualave.net>

